1	SCOTT N. SCHOOLS (SCSBN 9990) United States Attorney				
2	BRIAN J. STRETCH (CASBN 163973) Chief, Criminal Division				
4 5 6 7 8 9		ES DISTRICT COURT			
11	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
12	SAN JOSE DIVISION				
13					
14	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	No. CR 07-00434 RMW			
15	Plaintiff,	, STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER EXCLUDING TIME FROM			
16	v.	OCTOBER 1, 2007 TO OCTOBER 15, 2007 FROM THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT			
17	ELMER OCHOA-ALVAREZ,	CALCULATION (18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A))			
18	Defendant.	) ) )			
19					
20					
21	The parties stipulate that the time between October 1, 2007 and October 15, 2007 is excluded				
22	under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. §3161, and agree that the failure to grant the requested				
23	continuance would unreasonably deny defense counsel reasonable time necessary for effective				
24	preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. Finally, the parties agree that the				
25	ends of justice served by granting the requested continuance outweigh the best interest of the				
26	public, and the defendant in a speedy trial and in the prompt disposition of criminal cases.				
27					
28	//				

	Case 5:07-cr-00434-RMW	Document 22	Filed 10/04/2007	Page 2 of 3		
1	18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(8)(A).					
2						
3	DATED: October 4, 2007	SCOTT N. SCHOOLS United States Attorney				
4		Office Sta	nes Anomey			
5	/s/ BENJAMIN T. KENNEDY					
6	Assistant United States Attorney					
7						
8	/s/ CYNTHIA LIE					
9	Assistant Federal Public Defender					
10						
11						
12						
13						
14						
15						
16						
17						
18 19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						
26						
27						
28						

**ORDER** 

Based upon the stipulation of the parties, and for good cause shown, the Court HEREBY ORDERS that the time between October 1, 2007 and October 15, 2007 is excluded under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. §3161. The court finds that the failure to grant the requested continuance would unreasonably deny defense counsel reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. Furthermore, the Court finds that the ends of justice served by granting the requested continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial and in the prompt disposition of criminal cases. The court therefore concludes that this exclusion of time should be made under 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(8)(A).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED:

RONALD M. WHYTE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE